THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 13, No. 19 (Broadcast 611) May 8, 1967 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

HOW SOCIALISM PROPAGATES ITSELF

The proud, responsible individualism which was an essential component of American greatness is now openly scorned by many of our political and intellectual leaders, who are devotees of irresponsible collectivism. An able-bodied man who refuses to support himself or family is, in the collectivist view, a victim of society and has a *right* to be supported at public expense.

This collectivist view (probably the basic cause of rising crime rates, since it rejects the idea of individual responsibility) was bluntly expressed on April 6, 1967, by Guy R. Justis, director of the American Public Welfare Association. In Dallas as keynote speaker at an APWA meeting, Justis said that every American should be provided an adequate annual income as a matter of right, with only one criterion to establish his eligibility — need.[1]

Justis claimed that the Social Security Act, when passed 30 years ago, "recognized an individual's right to basic economic maintenance."[1]

That claim is untrue; but it provides a forensic base for Justis' argument in support of the proposal called "guaranteed income" or "negative tax."

The negative tax will set a minimum figure ($3000 is the one generally mentioned) for a family income. Every head-of-family with an income above $3000 a year will pay an income tax. If his income is below $3000, the government will give him enough to bring his income up to the minimum. There will be no questions asked as to *why* a man earned nothing, or less than the federally-prescribed minimum.

Mr. Justis says that the medicaid provisions of the Medicare law last year are compatible with, or set a precedent for, the negative tax proposal.[2] The Medicare law established several criteria for eligibility. To get Medicare, a person must be a certain age and must have paid some social security taxes; but to get medicaid (which is administered by states, financed on a matching-fund basis by federal and state governments) a person must meet only the criterion of having less annual income than the medicaid law says he should have.

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $18.00 for 2 years; $10.00, 1 year; $6.00, 6 months; first class, $12.50 a year; airmail, $14.50. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1967. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.
No Reproductions Permitted.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus, we see how socialism (or collectivism, which means the same) feeds upon itself. One program becomes a precedent for another, and one failure of socialism becomes justification for more socialism.

Social security was founded, not on the assumption that people have a right to public assistance, but on the assumption (inherent in all liberal-socialist-collectivist-communist programs) that people must be forced to prepare for the future because they are too stupid or irresponsible to be left to their own devices. Then, the assumption was gradually changed until it could be blandly asserted that social security "recognized an individual's *right* to basic economic maintenance."

Socialist programs were piled on top of socialist programs to guarantee this *right* of individuals. In addition to social security benefits being paid to some 20 million persons, we have a vast number of multi-billion-dollar welfare programs. They have all failed, however, to meet every "individual's right to basic economic maintenance." Collectivists lobbied for these programs, and collectivists have administered them since their inception. Yet, collectivists now belittle them as a "crazy quilt" of schemes with "confusing, demeaning, irrelevant" requirements for eligibility.[2]

The *classic* example of socialism building on its own failures can be found in the evolution of government's unconstitutional public housing activities.

Federally-financed public housing began with Franklin D. Roosevelt's PWA. The stated purpose was to create jobs by helping the construction industry. Immediately after World War II, the stated purpose of public housing was to relieve housing shortages.

The Public Housing Act of 1949 gave federal activity in this field the welfare purpose of providing housing for the poor. This objective was gradually expanded into the broader social purpose of eliminating slums.

By the mid-1950's, federal activity under the Public Housing Act of 1949 had evolved into urban renewal, whose purpose is much broader than mere slum clearance. Urban renewal is a federally-financed program of *city planning*, requiring renovation of entire sections of cities. All private property in an urban renewal area — whether slum, blighted, or otherwise — is confiscated by city governments (largely with tax money controlled by federal bureaucrats), then resold, at below cost, to private developers for projects pleasing to federal planners.

The Demonstration Cities Act of 1966 (now called the Model Cities Program) vastly expanded the urban renewal idea.

A city applying for a Model Cities Program grant to rebuild a neighborhood must show that its plans mesh with larger plans for remodeling the entire city; that the city-wide planning is geared to comparable planning in neighboring communities; and that all of the plans are an integral part of one master plan for a greater metropolitan or regional area.

In short, the Model Cities Program will use tax money to help transform our union of states into a regionally-planned, monolithically-unified nation, divided into areas which sprawl across state boundary lines. Each area will be ruled, at the local level, by a metropolitan government consisting of appointed experts answerable, not to the people they govern, but to the supreme political and planning power and dispenser of tax money in Washington, D. C.

Most states had to pass some kind of "home rule" statute to enlarge the powers of city governments before cities could confiscate private property for urban renewal projects. Now, to meet requirements of the Model Cities Program, most states are under pressure to enact state-wide zoning laws, and "regional planning" statutes which will authorize political subdivisions of states to collaborate in establishing Regional Planning Commissions.

Urban renewal stressed economic integration and beautification (as conceived by governmental

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

planners). Model Cities planning stresses these, plus social and racial integration. Model Cities must not have poor, middle-class, and wealthy neighborhoods. All economic groups, as well as all racial and ethnic groups, must be mixed in all neighborhoods. Industries and businesses must be located, not on the basis of economic decisions made by private management, but on the basis of social and political decisions made by bureaucrats.

Before the Demonstrations Cities Act became law, socialists had already begun a propaganda drive to expand government's activities in urban planning beyond the scope of the Model Cities Program.

On September 12, 1966, John Kenneth Galbraith made the keynote speech to a meeting of Conference of Urban America, Inc., in Washington, D. C. Galbraith (a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, formerly a presidential assistant and ambassador in the Kennedy administration) is now head of Americans for Democratic Action, the fabian socialist group that runs the national Democrat Party.

Galbraith deplored the fact that society has permitted free-market economics to control architectual designs in our cities: people should not be permitted to build what they want, where they want it, on their own land; an artistic elite should be the arbiters of taste, and their concept of beauty should be imposed on the whole of society; the most beautiful cities were built in lands where there were strong rulers, even despots, to impose good taste on the people; that is what we must have in the United States.

Galbraith says that economic needs (in the building of our cities) must give way to aesthetic needs; efficiency must be sacrificed to charm. Experts will decide what is aesthetic and charming, and government will enforce their decisions. Galbraith acknowledges that such planning is incompatible with private ownership of land, saying:

"For good urban, suburban and adjacent land use, we will need to resort increasingly to public ownership of the strategic land areas. Nor does it take a political genius to see the prospect here for some bloodletting."(3)

In an open letter to the Mayor of Dallas, published as part of the Neiman-Marcus ad in *The Dallas Morning News* on May 1, 1967, Stanley Marcus (a member of the Council on Foreign Relations) parrots the line of CFR-member Galbraith — namely, that the most beautiful cities are those built in foreign lands under strong governments which imposed good taste and proper planning, as contrasted with our cities which, built by private initiative, have "become strangled by a mass of steel and asphalt."

Constitutionalists could stop our headlong rush toward the bloodletting which Galbraith anticipates, and the adoption of the totalitarian system which he and other CFR leaders recommend, if we had means to reach the public with the truth about what is happening. Herein lies our biggest problem.

An article by Neil Hickey, in the April 15, 1967, issue of *TV Guide* condemns me and others as self-appointed superpatriots, and radical right extremists, who peddle "gloom, doom, hatred, and fear" for the sole purpose of making money. The article gives the false impression that radical right extremists dominate radio and tv broadcasting, saying:

"Radicals of the left have no voice on American TV and radio similar to that of their Rightists opponents. An avowed Communist has no access to tax-free foundation money nor to the contributions required for the purchase of air time."(4)

It is revealing of Hickey's own viewpoint that he equates communists, whose purpose is to destroy our constitutional system, with constitutionalists, whose purpose is to defend and restore the Constitution. Hickey does, however, present one truth in admitting that we, whom he calls "superpatriots," are opposed to communism.

One good way to see the falsity and distortion is to compare, in *TV Guide* itself, the listings of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

programs which Hickey condemns, with listings of news commentaries, documentaries, and press conferences expressing the liberal viewpoint.

You will find that constitutionalists have thinly scattered coverage, mostly on small, independent stations, while totalitarian liberals have almost limitless access to the mass media. In fact, totalitarian liberals reach more people, via radio and tv, in one day, than all constitutionalists reach in an entire year. Yet, liberals consider us a threat, because they evidently know that the people respond favorably to our viewpoint when they can hear it.

The big broadcasting networks provide many hours of prime time each week for the liberal commentaries of Chet Huntley, David Brinkley, Walter Cronkite, Eric Sevaried, Howard K. Smith, and a score of others; and they pay the commentators big salaries for making the broadcasts; but no network will provide time for sponsored programs by the "rightists" whom Hickey mentions

Every year, the networks and big independent stations give millions of dollars' worth of broadcast time to the President and his aides for propagandizing programs of totalitarian liberalism, but will not even sell time for constitutionalists to criticize the programs and suggest a constructive alternative — that is, a return to lawful, limited government as provided for in the Constitution.

Recently, for example, Mr. William Penn Patrick, President of Holiday Magic Cosmetics, tried to sponsor my once-a-week, 15-minute radio broadcast nationwide. He tried to buy time on both MBS and ABC radio networks, but was turned down.

Because of censorship by all major networks and most independent stations, I have never had national coverage for my radio or tv broadcasts; but, in a limited way, I have had them on the air continuously, in scattered markets, for 12 years. Wherever they have been on the air in a reasonably good time slot, they have proved that the public is enthusiastic about constitutionalist news reporting — and will support broadcast stations and sponsors that present it.

Yet, I have heard, in a roundabout way, that MBS and ABC radio officials refused my broadcast because they think it would damage their image with the public. This is especially interesting, because Mr. John P. Fraim (Chairman of the Board, Mutual Broadcasting Company, 135 West 50th Street, New York, New York 10020) and Mr. Robert R. Pauley (President of ABC radio, American Broadcasting Company, 1330 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10019) are said to be strong conservatives.

If Mr. Fraim and Mr. Pauley heard from as many people as I have about the public appreciation of constitutionalist news reporting, they might change their minds concerning what it takes to create a favorable image for their networks. I hope you will express your opinions to Mr. Fraim and Mr. Pauley in this regard. Please send copies of your letters to my sponsor (Mr. William Penn Patrick, Holiday Magic, 616 Canal Street, San Rafael, California 94901), so he, too, can evaluate the public attitude toward news broadcasting that criticizes the mushrooming growth of socialism in our time.

If we could get constitutionalist reporting into the media of mass communication just to the extent that it would have one-tenth the coverage that totalitarian liberalism has, we could stop socialism from destroying our free society.

FOOTNOTES

(1) "Guaranteed Income Urged," *The Dallas Times Herald*, April 6, 1967, p. A30

(2) "Guaranteed Income Called Proper Goal," by Dorothie Erwin, *The Dallas Morning News*, April 6, 1967, p. A14

(3) "Keynote Address By John Kenneth Galbraith at 'Our People And Their Cities,' A Conference Of Urban America, Inc., Washington, D. C., September 12, 1966," submitted by U. S. Rep. John Brademas (Indiana Democrat), *Congressional Record*, October 13, 1966, pp. 25662-4 (daily)

(4) "They Call Themselves Patriots," by Neil Hickey, *TV Guide*, April 15, 1967, pp. 14-17

REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE
(for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	100 copies	$ 6.50
10 copies	1.00	200 copies	12.00
25 copies	2.00	500 copies	28.00
50 copies	3.50	1000 copies	50.00

Texans Add 2% for Sales Tax

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT TAylor 1-2303
BOX 9538 DALLAS, TEXAS 75214

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED